

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of December 21, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-4, 6, 11-14, 18, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29-32 and 36 have been amended. Claim 8 has been cancelled. Claims 1-7 and 9-36 remain pending after entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

Applicants have amended claims 13 and 24 to recite, *inter alia*, a computer storage medium. Support for the claimed feature may be found throughout Applicants' specification and at least at pp. 12-13, paragraphs [0047]-[0049]. As such, this objection is respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

As discussed, claims 13 and 24 have been amended to be in a more preferred form. Support for the amendment may be found throughout Applicants' specification and at least at pp. 12-13, paragraphs [0047]-[0049]. Thus, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 13 and 24 have been amended to be in a more preferred form rendering this rejection moot. Additionally, claim 25 and 31 have also been amended to recite a processor. As such, the rejection with respect to claims 25 and 31 is also respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 8-17, 20-28, 30-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Desktop Sidebar v. 1.03 ("Desktop Sidebar"). Applicants have filed herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 rendering Desktop Sidebar an improper basis for rejection. Accordingly, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-17, 20-22, 24-28, 30-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Amro *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,745, “Amro”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “revealing a tile in a sidebar to represent the minimized application in response to the minimize command, the sidebar configured to display a plurality of tiles corresponding to a plurality of applications, wherein revealing the tile includes displaying one or more interactive application features of the minimized application in the tile.” Amro lacks a teaching or suggestion of such features. For example, nowhere does Amro teach or suggest displaying one or more interactive application features in a tile representing a minimized application in response to a minimize command. Amro generally discloses an active application bar 106 that includes active graphical objects 144 and 146 associated with a particular application. Col. 6, ll. 43-45. The Office Action asserts that the active graphical objects 144 and 146 constitute tiles. Even assuming, without conceding, the validity of the Office Action’s assertion, Amro still fails to teach or suggest that interactive application features are displayed in the active graphical objects. At best, Amro teaches a graphical selection area 102 having an icon function bar 112. However, the graphical selection area and the icon function bar of Amro are separate from graphical objects 144 and 146. *See, e.g.*, FIG. 6. As such, Amro does not teach or suggest displaying interactive application features in a tile as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-7 and 9-13 depend on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Amended independent claim 14 recites a method including features substantially similar to those recited in claim 1. For example, claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, “displaying, without user interaction other than the user command, at least a sub-set of interactive features belonging to the application in the minimized application in the sidebar.” Amro lacks any teaching or suggestion of such features. In fact, and as discussed above, Amro discloses displaying a graphical selection area and icon function bar separate from graphical objects (i.e., the alleged tiles), rather than in the minimized application as recited in claim 14. As such, claim 14 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 15-24 depend on claim 14 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Amended independent claim 25 recites, *inter alia*, “a sidebar for displaying a plurality of tiles; at least one application including an insertion module for inserting a tile into the sidebar, wherein one or more selected interactive features of the application are displayed in the tile when the application is represented by the tile in the sidebar; and user interface tools for allowing a user to command placement of a selected application into the sidebar.” Amro does not teach or suggest such features. As discussed previously, Amro lacks any teaching or suggestion of displaying one or more selected interactive features of an application in a tile representative of the application. Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 26-30 depend on claim 25 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 25 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Amended independent claim 31 recites a system comprising “an available feature selection module for allowing an application to provide selected interactive features of the application including at least a sub-set of a full feature set upon minimization of the application; and a tile insertion module for revealing a tile corresponding to the application upon minimization and for displaying the selected interactive features in the tile.” Amro fails to teach or suggest such features. As discussed with respect to claim 1, Amro is limited to displaying an icon function bar separately from active graphical objects. Claim 31 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 32-36 depend on claim 31 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 31 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 – Desktop Sidebar

Claims 6 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Desktop Sidebar in view of Oran *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,371, “Oran”). Claims 7 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Desktop Sidebar in view of Kramer *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,810, hereinafter “Kramer”). Claims 29 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Desktop Sidebar in view of Oran and further in view of Kramer.

As discussed above, Desktop Sidebar is not a valid basis for rejection. Further, the cited secondary references do not teach each and every feature of claims 6, 7, 18, 19, 29 and 35. Indeed, the Office Action does not assert that Oran or Kramer discloses every feature of the above recited claims and their respective base independent claims. Accordingly, claims 6, 7, 18, 19, 29 and 35 are allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 – Amro

Claims 6, 12, 18 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro in view of Oran. Claims 7 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro in view of Kramer. Claims 29 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro in view of Oran and further in view of Kramer. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As discussed, Amro does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in independent claims 1, 14, 25 and 31 from which claims 6, 7, 12, 18, 19, 23, 29 and 35 depend, respectively. Additionally, neither of the cited secondary references cures the above identified deficiencies of Amro. For example, nowhere does Oran or Kramer teach or suggest displaying one or more interactive application features of a minimized application in a tile of a sidebar, wherein the displaying is performed either without user interaction other than the minimize command or in response to minimization. At most, Oran discloses a context menu 66 that is displayed when the mouse cursor is positioned to point at taskbar button 44 and the right mouse button is depressed. Col. 8, ll. 14-17. Even if the context menu taught by Oran constitutes interactive features of an application, the context menu is not displayed in a tile associated with the application, as recited in claims 1, 14, 25 and 31. In addition, the context menu is not displayed in response to a minimize command (as recited in claim 1), without user interaction other than the minimize command (as recited in claim 14) or in response to minimization (as recited in claim 25). Kramer is similarly deficient. Accordingly, claims 6, 7, 12, 18, 19, 23, 29 and 35 are allowable for at least these reasons.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: June 21, 2007

By: /Chunhsing Andy Mu/
Chunhsing Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001